DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 800 JC 990 097

AUTHOR	Mize, Rita M.
TITLE	Full-Time Part-Time Faculty: A Proposal for Perspective.
INSTITUTION	Community Coll. League of California, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	1998-12-00
NOTE	16p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adjunct Faculty; *Administrative Policy; College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Faculty Workload; *Full Time Faculty; Legislation; *Part Time Faculty; School Personnel; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	California Community Colleges; Community College League of California

ABSTRACT

During the 1998-99 fiscal year, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges established a task force to consider issues regarding the hiring of part-time faculty to supplement core or full-time faculty. This policy paper examines the history and origins of the 75-25 ratio (states that 75% of credit instruction hours must be taught by full-time instructors), considers the research data on the effectiveness of full-time faculty, identifies the advantages and disadvantages of using part-time faculty, and proposes some possible modifications of laws and practice that would ensure the continued quality of community college education. The paper discusses the (1) California legislation from 1970 to 1998; (2) 1978-98 Board of Governors (BOG) agenda; (3) 1986 and 1987 Commission for Review of the Master Plan; (4) 1987 Joint Legislative Committee; (5) 1988 AACC Commission; (6) 1990 Western Association of Schools and Colleges; and (7) 1998 Chancellor's Consultation. Included are California and national data comparisons of full-/part-time faculty employment since 1975, research on the effectiveness of full- vs. part-time faculty, the advantages and disadvantages of part-time faculty, and recommendations for policymakers. Contains 22 references. (AS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 427 800

Full-Time Part-Time Faculty: A Proposal for Perspective

Rita M. Mize

Community College League of California
Sacramento

JC 990 097

R. Mize

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Community College League of California
2017 O Street, Sacramento CA 95814
916.444-8641 fax: 916.444-2954

FULL-TIME/PART-TIME FACULTY: A PROPOSAL FOR PERSPECTIVE

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the California community colleges have joined the rest of the nation in hiring part-time faculty to supplement core/full-time faculty; consequently, California also has joined the dialogue regarding the issues involved in determining the appropriate level of a core of full-time faculty supplemented by part-time faculty. These discussions concern both the numbers and credentials of part- vs. full-timers and the value and relative proportions of each which are appropriate for credit and noncredit instruction.

During the 1998-99 FY, Chancellor Nussbaum has established a "Part-Time/Full-Time Task Force" to examine the issues in preparation for the system to "develop and secure passage of a comprehensive resolution" to the issues. To assist in that examination, this policy paper will examine the history and origins of the 75-25 ratio, consider the research data on the effectiveness of full-time faculty, identify the advantages and disadvantages of using part-timers, and propose some possible modifications of law and practice which can assure the continued quality of community college education.

HISTORY OF POLICY AND PRACTICE

1970 Legislation – In 1970, the Education Code was amended to provide that after two years of satisfactory service, part-time faculty could be granted tenure. While the intent was to improve the lot of part-time faculty by giving stability and continuity to their service, the result was the reverse in some districts that instituted the "one-year full-time assignment" policy in which instructors were demoted to hourly pay after one year of full pay, benefits, and status. Although a predicted drop in enrollment had precipitated this type of assignment, enrollment actually increased and districts hired more temporary employees as permanent part-timers.

Subsequently, part-time faculty unionized and went to court (*Peralta Federation of Teachers Local 1603 et. al. vs. Peralta Community College District*) in 1975 to argue that the annual re-employment of teachers led to an implied contract for future employment. The court agreed with the faculty, ruling that twelve part-time faculty who had taught at least 60% of a regular load were eligible for tenure.

In response, districts restricted the numbers of hours per term per district to legally maintain their pool of permanent temporaries. Thus, before 1977, part-timers taught a full load each semester in one location for part time pay – now they were required to

teach several limited loads semester after semester in several locations, at the same hourly rate.

1978 Board Of Governors – In 1978, the Board Of Governors (BOG) received an agenda item from staff on the status and issues surrounding part-time faculty, and the BOG adopted the following policies:

- Support a single-track layoff system;
- Limit the amount of credit instruction delivered by part-time instructors to no more than 25% of all course hours, excluding non-credit courses and non-traditional colleges;
- Support equal pay for equal work; and
- Leave overload teaching to local control and collective bargaining while a study is conducted to determine its ultimate status.

1981 Legislation – According to the Chancellor's Office, the first statutory limits on part-time faculty were enacted in 1981 (AB 1626 – Chapter 103, Statutes of 1981) which "restricted districts from using part-time faculty to teach more than 30% of a district's workload or the average workload employed between 1980 and 1983." Under this statute, districts were to "determine if they were out of compliance and, if so, submit corrective plans to the Board of Governors for approval. In 1985, five districts did not comply with the statutes and submitted corrective plans to the Board of Governors." The Chancellor's Office noted that there were no sanctions in place for non-compliance nor were there statewide limits on the amount of part-time overload teaching that could be assigned to full-time faculty in addition to their regular load.

Subsequent legislation prohibited districts from employing more part-time instructors (as measured by weekly faculty contact hours) than they did on average over the three-year period from 1980-81 through 1982-83 without the approval of the BOG. This statutory language was described by the Master Plan Commission (1986) as "overly restrictive" and "better left to the BOG and the local colleges."

During these years, Assembly members John Vasconcellos and Bob Campbell annually carried legislation for the faculty to increase the number and/or percentages of full-time faculty, and/or provide sanctions for non-compliance with the law. Most of these efforts failed, until the enactment of AB 1725 in 1988.

1986 BOG – In 1986, the BOG requested CO staff to "develop an analysis and plan for solution to the part-time faculty issue" and the addendum to the Board's 1986 *Basic Agenda* called for "statutory changes which will more appropriately clarify and delineate the role of community college staff."

The resultant report, *Study of Part-time Instruction* (1986) reviewed current policy and practice on the use of part-time faculty, examined their characteristics and the implications of their use for the quality of instruction. Although the report relied primarily on existing studies, staff also developed surveys on current practices for part-time faculty in the colleges and in other states and found:

1) 39 districts provided part-time faculty with limited rights including 14 which provided reemployment rights.
2) Over half the colleges had a procedure for recruitment, screening, and selection of part-time faculty.
3) The distribution of workload among full-and part-time faculty was similar to that reported ten years earlier.
4) Most of the noncredit instruction and one-third of the class hours of credit instruction were taught by part-time faculty.
5) Most of the part-time faculty in credit courses were in business, computer science and data processing, public affairs, and other vocational or career-oriented disciplines.
6) Few part-time faculty had assignments beyond classroom instruction.
7) Half the districts evaluated part-time faculty at least annually.
8) There was concern about in-service opportunities for staff development, with 23 districts providing regular programs for staff development and training of part-time faculty.
9) On average, part-time faculty wages and fringe benefits averaged 55 percent of full-time faculty compensation.

The study also described characteristics of part-time faculty, provided comparisons with other states, and summarized the evidence on quality differences between part-time and full-time faculty. In this latter instance, the COCCC determined that the evidence was inconclusive, with studies showing no observable differences in the performance of full-time vs. part-time faculty, and involving only small samples in specific disciplines. However, the COCCC noted that the greater support provided by the colleges for full-time faculty seemed to be an important positive factor affecting their performance.

1986 Commission for Review of the Master Plan – As the Chancellor's Office study was in progress, the Commission for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education engaged in lengthy deliberations on a variety of issues affecting higher education in California. In its 1986 report, *The Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community College*, the Commission considered the employment of part-time faculty, and recommended that the Legislature repeal the statutory restriction which prohibited districts from employing part-time instructors in greater numbers – as measured by weekly faculty contact hours – than they did on average over the three-year period 1980-81 through 1982-83, without approval by the Board of Governors. The Commission made this recommendation because they concluded that the statutory provision was overly restrictive, and "the matter of part-time faculty, like virtually all other faculty matters, would be better left to the BOG and the colleges."

The Master Plan Commission also recommended that the BOG should be authorized to establish a statewide policy for community colleges consistent with the objective of maintaining a core of experienced full-time faculty in each major department; the Board of Governors urged the community colleges to require part-time instructors to participate in student advisement and curricular development in addition to classroom

instruction; and the Legislature authorize community college districts to employ part-time faculty who teach six units or more, on a contractual basis.

1987 Commission for Review of the Master Plan – In its second report, which covered all three segments, the Commission (1987) noted that public colleges and universities must be free to employ both part-time and full-time faculty to fill specific needs and to make the best use of available resources, but expressed concern that "some part-time faculty are overextended" and teach at multiple institutions with little time for contact with students, other faculty, or other faculty responsibilities outside of the classroom." Thus, they recommended that institutions ensure that teaching, counseling, and curricular responsibilities of part-time faculty be similar to those for full-time faculty, both in and out of the classroom, and that part-time faculty be compensated accordingly.

Noting that part-time faculty were used more frequently in community colleges, the commission sought to encourage the BOG to make an extra effort to ensure that instructional quality did not suffer as a result, and recommended that:

> The segmental governing boards shall thoroughly evaluate policies regarding part-time faculty to ensure that all departmental and collegial responsibilities are met and, through periodic review, make sure that the use of part-time faculty does not undermine instructional quality or become excessive and is reduced where it is already excessive.
>
> The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall develop pilot programs that offer faculty rolling contracts of two to five years in length as an alternative to multiple part-time appointments at several institutions, giving the colleges greater latitude in meeting staffing needs, and permitting part-time faculty to better meet student needs. Tenured faculty members should not be discouraged from transferring between districts as need occurs, and the board shall by policy ensure that tenure in one district can be regained in a new district in a relatively short period of time.

1987 Joint Legislative Committee – Subsequent to the Commission's report, the Joint Legislative Committee considered these issues and issued its report, *California Faces California's Future*. Its recommendations on part-time faculty mirrored those of the Master Plan Commission regarding the importance of the segmental governing boards evaluating their policies and ensuring that the use of part-time faculty not become excessive and undermine quality. The Committee further recommended that the results of the initial evaluation be made available to the Legislature by December 31, 1989, and each of the governing boards report to the Legislature on a biennial basis thereafter.

The Joint Committee also called for the segmental governing boards to prepare an analysis of the long-term costs of providing pro-rata pay and benefits for part-time faculty, with the analysis to include proposals for "alternative formulas for covering segments of the part-time faculty, depending upon analysis of the overall employment

profile for different part-time faculty." The results would be communicated to the Legislature by December 31, 1989.

1988 Legislation – Subsequent to publication of the Joint Committee's report, committee staff began working with the Californians for Community Colleges on a proposal which was to shape AB 1725. In these negotiated sessions, the "75-25" ratio was first proposed and eventually became the compromise between CEOs, administrators, and trustees who expressed their need for flexibility; and faculty members who believed that the actual ratio then occurring (67% of credit hours of instruction were taught by full-time faculty) put too heavy a burden on too few full-time instructors. The compromise became feasible because it was voluntary (i.e., only those who accepted the Program Improvement Funds were required to participate) and there were funds to pay for the proposal ($70 million annually for each of two years.) When AB 1725 (Ch. 973, Statutes of 1988) formally established the statutory goal that 75 percent of credit instruction hours be taught by full-time instructors, it also required districts with fewer than 75% of their hours of credit instruction taught by full-time instructors to use a specified portion – depending on how far they were from the 75% goal – of their program improvement funds to hire full-time instructors.

(AB 1725 did not include language for the general analysis or the biennial report on use of part-time instructors, or the Committee's recommendation that the boards consider alternative formulas for covering segments of the part-time faculty. Consequently, these studies and activities did not occur. AB 1725 did require a three-district pilot program for employing part-time faculty through option-rollover contracts. The study did not occur, though, because the mandate remained unfunded.)

1988 AACC Commission – In 1988, the National Commission on the Future of Community Colleges issued *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century* which found that between 1973 and 1986, the percentage of part-time community college instructors nationally had risen from 41 percent to 60 percent of the total, and "about 25 percent of all community college credits are earned through classes taught by part-time teachers." The commission was convinced that "part-time faculty are not only a necessary resource but can also powerfully enrich the college through the diversity and breadth of experience they bring to the campus," but noted that, "the increasing numbers of part-time faculty at many colleges are a disturbing trend. Although part-time faculty members contribute to a vibrant institution, it is obviously more difficult for them to advise students, to collaborate with colleagues, and to participate in institutional life in ways that build community... For community colleges to fulfill their potential, part-time faculty, regardless of their numbers, must be carefully integrated into the institution...." Finally, the commission recommended that:

- Every community college should have a policy regarding the selection, orientation, evaluation, and renewal of part-time faculty. These colleagues should be given the professional support necessary ... to be effective members of the college community.
- ...[U]nrestrained expansion of part-time faculty [must] be avoided. As a general rule, a majority of credits awarded by a community college should be

earned in classes taught by full-time faculty. Any deviation from this goal should be based upon clearly defined institutional objectives.

1988 CPEC – In 1988, CPEC noted that 40% of California part-time faculty continued to work in one district more or less continuously and recommended that "heavy reliance on part-time faculty" be reduced and be "incorporated into the collegial faculty process...," although it did not specify how those suggestions might be accomplished.

1990 BOG – Once program improvement funds were no longer available and program-based funding was implemented, most of the full-time/part-time provisions in AB 1725 were converted into Board of Governors' regulations (Title 5 Section 53300 et. seq.). This amended language requires that, in any fiscal year in which the Board of Governors certifies by January 20th that "adequate growth and adequate cost-of-living [COLA] funds have been provided to allow full or partial implementation," the districts are to use a portion of the COLA and growth funds to increase their percentage of full-time faculty.

1990 WASC – Iadevaia (1991) began research on the effectiveness of full-time vs. part-time faculty because the issue had surfaced during an accreditation review at Pima College. As part of his research on effectiveness, Iadevaia reviewed the standards of the various accreditation bodies, and found that none of them had a numerical ratio of full-time to part-time faculty; however, all the agencies (including the Accrediting Commission of Community and Junior Colleges – ACCJC—of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges – WASC) had "implied standards" which included criteria such as maintenance of curriculum, student advising, and continuity. In correspondence with Iadevaia, Petersen (1990) stated that WASC "has not established a consistent standard on the part-time /full-time ratio. Institutions and disciplines differ greatly. An acceptable part-time ratio in Law Enforcement or Real Estate might be unacceptable in English or mathematics." Petersen continued, "We are concerned about the trend to over-dependence on part-time faculty in some institutions. We have established as a ... requirement that there be a core of full-time faculty," which led Iadevaia to conclude that the "non-standard" regarding full-time vs. part-time faculty ratios seemed "arbitrary at best."

1998 BOG – The full-time part-time provisions in regulations were modified further in 1998 to broaden the definition of faculty calculated within the 75-25 ratio to include non-instructional (e.g., counselors and librarians) as well as instructional faculty. Thus, a district would be able to count hires in these non-instructional areas in calculating progress toward the 75-25 ratio and would be encouraged to hire full-timers as they expanded vital library and counseling services for their students.

1998 Chancellor's Consultation – Currently, the issue of the 75-25 ratio is under review in a Chancellor's Office task force which is considering three major issues:

1) Development of a $40 million budget change proposal for hiring full-time faculty, and included in the system's budget request for 1999-2000. This request presumably would be followed by requests for similar amounts of money in each of the four subsequent fiscal years, for system funding of $200 million.
2) Consideration of a new proposal to allow districts one year of grace to hire either the number of full-time faculty projected in the prior Fall or the number of full-time faculty who should be hired based on actual (P2) data, whichever is less.
3) Discussions on which faculty categories should be counted in determining the appropriate ratio, e.g., should full-time temporary faculty be counted? The task force also will consider whether each category should be counted in the numerator, the denominator, or neither.

California and National Data Comparisons

Since 1975, California community colleges have employed between 15,200 and 16, 850 full-time faculty, while the number of part-time faculty has ranged between 25,000 and 30,000 for the same years. The highest number of full-timers (16,850) were employed in 1990-92 (the years of AB 1725 program improvement) and Fall 1981 (16,650), with the lowest number (15,216) employed in the recession of 1995 (Nussbaum, 1998).

Nationally, about 65 percent of all community college instructors are part-time – with 179,122 part-time and 97,291 full-time faculty, out of a total of 276,413 faculty members. In California, the number are almost identical (65.6% or 29,230 part-time faculty and 34.4% were employed as full-time faculty in 1996 (Nussbaum, 1998).

Research on the Effectiveness of Full- vs. Part-time Faculty

Although there has been extensive debate on the effectiveness of part-time vs. full-time instructors, there is relatively little data on this topic; most of it uses a small sample and cannot be generalized. Also, researchers frequently note the difficulty in attributing the effects of isolating a dependent variable and determining its sole impact upon achievement. Some policymakers concentrated on the issue of the effectiveness of full- vs. part-time faculty, asking about the outcomes for students – whether students taught by full-timers achieve at higher levels or in any way evidence superior outcomes. The case for this proposition is limited, at best.

Boggs (1985) studied freshman composition courses at Butte College and found no statistically significant difference in the performance of students taught by part-timers and those taught by full-time faculty. However, he did find that part-time students performed better in a subsequent composition course if the developmental writing course had been taught by a part-time instructor.

The Chancellor's Office (1986) reviewed all the effectiveness studies to date and concluded that:

> "In summary, the evidence on quality differences for the issue of part-time and full-time faculty is not conclusive. Reported empirical studies of student performance and persistence show no observable differences. The quality of instruction in the classroom seems largely a function of the individual faculty member. However, given two equally knowledgeable...and energetic faculty members — one teaching full-time, the other teaching part-time – institutions need to provide at least proportionately equal, [and] in some cases, perhaps more, support for the part-timers if the two individuals are to be similarly equipped to teach the class..."

Sworder (1987) conducted a study of student preferences at Saddleback Community College and concluded that the quality of instruction by part-timers was equivalent to that of full-time instructors.

In 1990, Spangler collected statistics from reading and writing examinations at Los Angeles Valley Community College and found that students taught by part-timers do not perform as well as those taught by full-time faculty.

Iadevaia (1991) examined grades at Pima Community College to determine whether teaching by a full-time or a part-time science faculty member was more effective, and concluded that there was no difference in student success rate for full- and part-time faculty either in general or in science classes.

Kelly (1992) investigated classroom results of training part-time faculty in new teaching techniques at Fullerton College. He found high student and teacher satisfaction with the learning process but no significant increase in student retention as a result of the training.

Mattice and Richardson (1993) explored the effects of participation in the Associate Program for Adjunct Faculty (APAF) at College of the Canyons. The study showed very little difference in teaching-learning processes or in classroom behavior between part-time faculty who participated in APAF and those who did not participate.

Stovall (1994), at Valencia College, found no relationship between student performance in classes taught by adjunct vs. full-time faculty using grade distribution as a measure of performance.

Bolge (1995), in his study of Mercer Community College (Trenton, NJ) students in remedial mathematics, found no significant difference when post-test scores were compared for students instructed by part-timers vs. full-timers.

ADVANTAGES OF PART-TIME FACULTY

There are many cited advantages, for individuals, students, and the colleges when part-time faculty are hired and used in appropriate positions. Among these advantages are:

1) Some faculty prefer part-time work in order to be more available for their families and/or other jobs.
2) Part-time faculty provide an important level of expertise which allows the colleges to provide up-to-date instruction from persons currently employed in the field.
3) Part-time instructors typically cost less than an equivalent full-time instructor.
4) The ability to hire and dismiss without the extensive requirements of multiple lay-off notices and hearings is an important element in budget flexibility for the colleges.
5) Often part-time instructors will be assigned to either introductory classes or others which full-time faculty do not want to teach, thus freeing full-time faculty for teaching the more advanced courses.

DISADVANTAGES OF PART-TIME FACULTY

Likewise, there are a number of cited disadvantages in the hiring of part-time faculty, for the individuals, students, and the colleges. These include:

1) Assignment of part-time faculty to core courses which should be taught by full-time instructors.
2) Continued employment of part-time faculty for identical classes over many years with no contract, tenure, or other secure commitment on the part of the college or district.
3) Lack of benefits for part-time faculty or their families.
4) Lack of office hours for most part-time faculty which makes their job difficult for both the faculty member and for the student needing to speak with an instructor.
5) Few part-time faculty members are permitted full participation in academic decision making. They typically are not involved in hiring, curriculum planning, and program evaluation, which are central to shared campus participation and involvement.
6) Part-time instructors seldom participate in faculty seminars, team-teach with colleagues, collaborate on research, write grant proposals or engage in other elements which contribute positively to collegiate life and strengthen both the instructor and the program in which he/she is employed.
7) When too many part-time instructors are employed in a department or college, the burdens of advising students, curriculum planning and governance must be handled by the remaining full-time instructors.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICYMAKERS

There are at least two different options with regard to the hiring of full-time vs. part-time instructors. They are:

1) Increase the percentage of credit hours taught by full-time instructors.
2) Retain the current system, with important modifications.

Since there is no consistent belief that there are differences between full-time and part-time instructors, based on their "part-timeness," and there is concern regarding whether enough faculty members, whatever their status, are involved in non-teaching duties, such as advising, curriculum planning and evaluations, the second option is a quite viable one. Several commentators (Gappa and Leslie, 1993; Spangler, 1990) have made recommendations including the following which should be reviewed and considered by any policymaker interested in resolving this issue.

These recommendations are based upon a review of the alternatives available including the elimination or reduction of part-time faculty. Most commentators conclude, however, that it is "utterly unrealistic and potentially dangerous to the long-term viability of the total faculty work force" to eliminate part-time instructors (Gappa and Leslie, 1993). They state "in our view, nothing in the national statistics or in our experience with individual community colleges and universities even remotely suggested that radical cutbacks were feasible," and suggest instead that "tight budgets, scarce talent, shifting enrollment patterns, and other factors seem to point to increasing rather than reducing part-time temporary and other nontraditional appointments."

Upon considering ways to improve working conditions for part-time faculty, so they can do their best work, the importance of more equitable policies for part-timers, and of planning and managing use of part-time faculty to help meet educational goals instead of allowing fiscal conditions to dictate staffing decisions, the following possibilities are proposed:

1) Develop goals for use of part-time faculty based on the educational mission of the college or university.
2) Include use of part-time faculty in the overall faculty staffing plan.
3) Consult part-time faculty during the development of the faculty staffing plan.
4) Assign responsibilities, delegate authority, develop policies and guidelines and review and monitor adherence to policy.
5) Systematically and routinely gather and use accurate and timely data on part-time faculty for decision-making purposes.
6) Periodically survey part-time faculty for additional information about perceptions of conditions under which they work, their satisfaction with employment, and other concerns and interests.
7) Assess the benefits and short and long-term costs of employing part-time faculty;

8) Review and evaluate the faculty staff plan regularly for fair employment policies and practices, including:
   a) Accept part-time faculty as important and valued faculty members.
   b) Provide options for flexibility to accommodate careers balanced by personal commitments, provide career paths, and reward demonstrated performance.
   c) Meet justified expectations of part-time faculty for decent, consistent treatment without exploitation.
   d) Give part-timers the tools to do the job – advance notification to prepare, honest feedback on their work, and development opportunities.
9) Establish a campus-wide representative body to give advice on part-time faculty employment practices.
10) Publicize and distribute part-time faculty employment policies in the faculty manual and distribute it to all department chairs and faculty, especially part-time faculty.
11) Make department chairs responsible for implementing part-time faculty employment policies consistently.
12) Offer a range of employment options for part-time faculty, including appointments that recognize the nature of their employment for those with bona fide continuing relationships, while only truly contingent or short-term emergency appointments should be treated as such.
13) Provide tenure for long-term part-time faculty.
14) Provide security and due process rights for part-timers with seniority and records of effective performance.
15) Appoint continuing part-time faculty for more extended periods.
16) Establish career tracks that provide rewards and incentives (such as 3-5 year contracts) for long-term service and/or high achievement.
17) Identify qualifications for part-time faculty that are legitimately related to job requirements.
18) Recruit, select, and hire part-time faculty proactively, since the majority remain for years and are not temporary workers.
19) Seek the means to assure a diverse part-time faculty pool.
20) Provide early and timely notification of appointments to part-time positions.
21) Develop a part-time faculty scale with merit pay and cost-of-living adjustments if full-timers receive them.
22) Ensure consistent compensation for part-timers in departments and institutions;
23) Set standards for progression through the salary scale.
24) Provide benefits to continuing part-time faculty (allow them to use sports facilities and health benefits – although few need them, some of those who do need them desperately).
25) Develop objective performance criteria and procedures for evaluating part-time faculty and use the results to make decisions for reappointment.

26) Provide support services – including adequate space and access to equipment for appropriate preparation for class, to advise students, clerical support.

27) Communicate the message that part-time faculty are important to the institution.

28) Give the department chairs responsibility and incentives to supervise part-time faculty (including release time, administrative support and incentive pay as compensation for work with part-time workers).

29) Orient department chairs to good supervisory practice.

30) Invite part-time faculty to share perceptions of effective supervisory practice at department chair training sessions.

31) Use teams of experienced faculty (both full-time and part-time) to develop new faculty members' teaching skills.

32) Provide faculty mentors to inexperienced part-timers.

33) Engage full-time and part-time faculty in course coordination.

34) Involve part-time faculty in assessment of student learning.

35) Appoint part-time faculty to committees.

36) Involve part-time faculty in informal talk.

37) Invite part-time faculty to social events.

38) Publicly recognize part-time faculty for their achievements and contributions.

39) Orient part-time faculty to the institution and its expectations.

40) Conduct frequent workshops on good teaching practices.

41) Provide in-service professional development opportunities for part-time faculty.

42) Provide incentives for good performance.

43) Use teaching evaluations to help part-time faculty improve.

Bibliography

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. *Community, Technical, and Junior Colleges: A Summary of Selected National Data.* Washington, D.C: AACJC, 1987

Banachowski, Grace. *Perspectives and Perceptions: A Review of the Literature on the Use of Part-time Faculty in Community Colleges.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Boggs, G. *An Evaluation of the Instructional Effectiveness of Part-time Community College Developmental Writing Faculty.* Doctoral dissertation. Austin: The University of Texas, 1985.

Bolge, R.D.. *Examination of Student Learning as a Function of the Instructor's Status (Full-time vs. Part-time) at Mercer County Community College.* Trenton: Mercer CC, Trenton, New Jersey, 1995. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (ED 382 241).

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. *Study of Part-time Instruction.* Chancellor's Office: Sacramento, January 1987. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (ED 278 449).

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Preparing for the Twenty-First Century: A Report on Higher Education in California.* Commission Report 88-1. Sacramento, 2/88.

_____. *The Need for New Faculty Members.* Sacramento: The Commission, June 11, 1990, Draft.

Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. *The Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges.* The Commission: Sacramento, 1987.

_____ *Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education (Issue Papers: The Master Plan Renewed).* The Commission: Sacramento, 1987.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. *Building Community: A Vision for a New Century.* AACJC: Washington, D.C., 1988. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (ED 293 578).

Grappa, Judith M., and David Leslie. *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education.* Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 1993.

Gallery G.M. *Part-time Legislation.* Item 1. Report for the BOG, Sacramento, CA, January 1978.

Iadevaia, D.G. *A Comparison of Full-time and Part-Time Faculty and Full-Time to Part-Time Science Faculty in Terms of Student Success at Pima Community College.* (Ed.D.

Major Applied Research Project, Nova University), 1991. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (ED 339 403).

Kelly. *Part-time And Evening Faculty: Promoting Teaching Excellence for Adult Evening College Students.* Fullerton, CA: Final Report of 1991-92 Fund for Instructional Improvement Grant Project, 1992. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (ED 348 088).

Lombardi, J. "The Ambiguity of the Part-Time Faculty," in J. Lombardi and A.M. Cohen (Eds) *Perspectives on the Community Colleges: Essays* (pgs 51-67). Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1992. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (ED 349 041).

Mattice, N.J. and Richardson R.D. *College of the Canyons Survey of Teaching Practices, Spring 1993.* Valencia, CA Office of Institutional Development, 1993. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (ED 357 776)

Murphy, B.M., Telephone conversation with author, November 10, 1998.

Nussbaum, T., *WeeklyE-Mail Update*, December 1, 1998.

Petersen, J. Correspondence (to D.G. Iadevaia), July 5, 1990.

Spangler, M.S. *Part-time Faculty: Recognizing an Unprotected Minority.* Position paper (120), Los Angeles, CA: 1990. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education (ED 277 408).

Stovall, R.H. *Adjunct Information.* "Student Performance in Classes Taught by Adjunct vs. Full-time Faculty." 2(3), Spring 1994.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE